

### **REMARKS**

Claims 23, 44, 53, 55, 65, 68, 74 76 are amended. Claim 127 is new.

Support for the graphical user interface added to claim 1 may be found, for example, in the specification at paragraphs [0075], [0637] and FIGs 2-4.

Support for the addition of the relationship between the subcomponent option transactions and an underlying instrument may be found, for example, in the specification at paragraph [0064] and throughout the specification.

Support for the recitations that the versatile financial transaction is at a higher level than the subcomponent option transactions may be found, for example, in the specification at paragraph [0065].

Support for the recitations that the subcomponent option transactions are a specific type of option transaction may be found, for example, in the specification at paragraphs [0028] – [0068].

Support for the recitations that the user is presented with a confirmation of an execution of the trade may be found, for example, in the specification at paragraph [0067], [0068] and [0081].

Thus, no new matter is added with this amendment.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Several claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. These claims have been amended to remove the terms “hierarchical” and “substantially simultaneously.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Several claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they allegedly were not directed to statutory subject matter. Independent claims 23, 44 and 65 are amended so that

the claimed method is performed at or by a computer system. Independent claim 83 is canceled and independent claim 127 is a new Beauregard claim in the form suggested by the examiner in the previous official action. Accordingly, those claims are now tied to another statutory class, and are patent eligible under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103**

Each of the currently pending independent claims recites something similar to: a versatile financial transaction that is related to an underlying instrument, and includes a plurality of interrelated, subcomponent, option transactions, wherein each of the interrelated, subcomponent, option transactions is also related to the same underlying instrument. The versatile financial transaction is at a higher level than each of the interrelated, subcomponent, option transactions. Thus, the versatile financial transaction is, in other words, a package or combination of interrelated multi-leg transactions which may be simply selected by a user and executed as a single versatile transaction. None of the prior art relied upon in the official action discloses such a versatile financial transaction.

#### **1. Claim 23**

Amended claim 23 recites a method in a computer system of generating a versatile financial transaction that includes providing a user a graphical user interface to select a versatile financial transaction from a plurality of possible versatile financial transactions; receiving at the computer system an order from the user for the versatile financial transaction, wherein the versatile financial transaction is related to an underlying instrument; wherein the versatile financial transaction is comprised of at least five subcomponent option transactions, wherein each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions is related to the underlying instrument; wherein the user's ordered versatile financial transaction is at a higher level than each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions; electronically processing the order for the subcomponent option transactions; wherein the subcomponent option transactions are interrelated; wherein each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions is a specific type of option transaction; wherein subcomponent parameters specified in the order are based

on ordering requirements made for the versatile financial transaction, transmitting via the computer system the interrelated subcomponents to a trade executing entity for fulfillment; and presenting the user, via the graphical user interface, with a confirmation of an execution of trades for each of the order's subcomponents.

In particular, amended claim 23 recites a versatile financial transaction that is related to an underlying instrument; wherein the versatile financial transaction is comprised of at least five subcomponent option transactions, wherein each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions is related to the underlying instrument; wherein the user's ordered versatile financial transaction is at a higher level than each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions; wherein the subcomponent option transactions are interrelated; and wherein each of the at least five subcomponent option transactions is a specific type of option transaction. These limitations distinguish the references relied on in the official action.

With respect to amended claim 23, neither Himmelstein nor Nefeh provide any disclosure of a versatile financial transaction that includes at least five subcomponent option transactions, wherein each of the subcomponent option transactions is related to the same underlying instrument. In contrast, Himmelstein discloses "barter orders" that "may be created for stock and Himmelstein Option for stock barterers as illustrated..." Himmelstein, Col. 9, ll 23-24. Himmelstein thus appears to merely disclose bartering shares of one stock for shares of another stock. This is completely different from a versatile financial transaction that includes a plurality of interrelated, subcomponent, option transactions, wherein each of the interrelated, subcomponent, option transactions is also related to the same underlying instrument. If the versatile financial transaction recited in amended claim 23 is related to IBM stock, for example, then each of the interrelated, subcomponent, option transactions would also be related to the same IBM stock.

Furthermore, Himmelstein does not appear to disclose any type of transaction that includes interrelated, subcomponent, option transactions that are at a lower level than a higher level versatile financial transaction. In contrast, Himmelstein appears to only disclose bartering for items that are at the same level.

Furthermore, Nefeh does not appear to disclose the claim limitations missing from Himmelstein. Applicant thus respectfully submits that amended claim 23 is in condition for allowance.



**2. Claims 44, 49, 53, and 55**

Amended independent claim 44 is directed to a method in a computer system of generating a versatile financial transaction that includes identifying an underlying financial instrument; identifying a versatile financial transaction for the underlying financial instrument, wherein the versatile financial transaction includes at least three subcomponent option transactions; providing an order for processing the subcomponent option transactions; wherein the subcomponent option transactions are interrelated, wherein each of the subcomponent option transactions is a specific type of option transaction; wherein the identified versatile financial transaction is at a higher level than each of the subcomponent option transactions; wherein subcomponent parameters specified in the order are based on ordering requirements made in identifying the versatile financial transaction, transmitting via the computer system the interrelated subcomponents to a trade executing entity for fulfillment, generating via the computer system a confirmation of an execution of a trade on the versatile financial transaction.

Similar to claim 23, amended claim 44 specifically recites identifying a versatile financial transaction that includes at least three subcomponent option transactions; wherein the subcomponent option transactions are interrelated, wherein each of the subcomponent option transactions is a specific type of option transaction; and wherein the identified versatile financial transaction is at a higher level than each of the subcomponent option transactions.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, neither of the applied patents disclose such a versatile financial transaction. It is thus respectfully submitted that amended claim 44, and claims 49, 53, and 55 dependent thereon, are in condition for immediate allowance.

**3. Claims 65, 66, 68-70, 74, 76-79, and 81**

Independent claim 65 recites a method in a computer system of generating a versatile financial transaction that includes receiving at the computer system an order for the versatile financial transaction for an underlying financial instrument, wherein the versatile financial transaction includes at least three subcomponent option transactions; processing the order for the subcomponent option transactions; wherein the subcomponent transactions are

interrelated, wherein each of the at least three subcomponent option transactions is related to the underlying financial instrument; wherein the ordered versatile financial transaction is at a higher level than each of the at least three subcomponent option transactions; wherein each of the at least three subcomponent option transactions is a specific type of option transaction; effecting the execution of trades on the order's subcomponents.

These limitations recited above are similar to limitations found in claims 23 and 44. Claim 65, and claims 66, 68-70, 74, 76-79, and 81 dependent thereon, are thus allowable for the reasons discussed above.

#### **4. Claim 127**

New independent claim 127 recites a memory storage containing instructions configured to be executed by a processor, the instructions which, when executed by the processor, cause the performance of a method that includes displaying a plurality of versatile financial transactions from which a user may choose; facilitating a user in selecting a specific versatile financial transaction from the plurality of versatile financial transactions, wherein the selected versatile financial transaction is related to either a stock or a future; wherein the selected versatile financial transaction includes three or more interrelated, subcomponent, option transactions, wherein each of the three or more subcomponent option transactions is related to either the stock or the future; wherein the selected versatile financial transaction is at a higher level than each of the three or more subcomponent option transactions; transmitting the interrelated subcomponents to a trade executing entity for fulfillment; and displaying to the user a confirmation of an execution of a trade for the selected versatile financial transaction.

These limitations recited above are similar to limitations found in claims 23, 44 and 65. Claim 127 is thus allowable for the reasons discussed above.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the above application is in condition for allowance, and reconsideration is respectfully requested. If there is any matter that the Examiner would like to discuss, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned

Application No. 10/597,107  
Amendment dated October 26, 2009  
After Final Office Action of April 24, 2009

Docket No.: 31578/44898

representative at the telephone number set forth below. In any event, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 31578/44898.

Dated: October 26, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Randall G. Rueth

Registration No.: 45,887

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant